



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,988	08/04/2003	Seong Ho Kang	YHK-0115	2974	
34610 KED & ASSO	7590 01/07/2008 CIATES IIP	EXAMINER			
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200			BODDIE, WILLIAM		
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2629		
				·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		•	01/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/632,988	KANG ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
William L. Boddie	2629

			l .
	William L. Boddie	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 December 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complicing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external process. 	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	within the time period set forth in 3	37 CFR 41.37(a).	ic appeal. Cilio
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ACSUSA
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further compared 			ccause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		, ,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		•	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi ovided below or appended.	ll be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-7,9-11,13-15 and 20-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered be	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:		า	
·		umeti h	flund
		OUMATU EEVOW	₁₁₇ V

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ* SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claim amendments would alter the scope of dependent claims 4 and 5 to include limitations which were not previously present. Furthermore the Applicants' arguments traversing the rejections of claims 1, 7 and 11 are not persuasive. On pages 10-11 of the Remarks, the Applicants' argue that Tokunaga does not disclose applyign different waveforms in the set-up interval at different temperatures. The Applicants' sole grounds being that the waveform applied by Tokunaga is the merely altered in width at the different temperatures and is thus the same waveform. The Examiner must respectfully disagree. To say that a waveform is the still the same after the width of the waveform has been altered is seen as incorrect by the Examiner. It seems obvious that altering the waveform in anyway will create a new waveform. Waveform is defined by Random House's Unabridged Dictionary as "the shape of a wave, a graph obtained by plotting the instantaneous values of a periodic quantity against the time." Tokunaga dislcoses altering the shape of the wave, by plotting different instantaneous values of a periodic quantity against time as shown in figure 8. For these reasons Tokunaga is seen as disclosing applying different waveforms during different temperatures as discussed in the previous office action. As such the rejections of claims 1, 7 and 11 are seen as proper and are thus maintained.

On page 11 of the remarks, the Applicants merely state the the temperature range of 20 degrees to -50 degrees is not design choice. Absent any showing, as to why this range was not an obvious design choice, the Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to select such a range as this is the approximate range at which brightness misfires are likely to occur.